Destiny and Will

Darío Ricardo De Santiago Sasinka
Affiliation: https://www.frc.utn.edu.ar
ORCID: 0000-0002-7684-9532
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18522396

February 2026

Resumen

The text argues that time is not a container of events but a virtual dimension of transformation, so that only the present exists ontologically, which is actualized irreversibly. Reality is organized into three levels: a microscopic level of indeterminacy, a hyperscopic level dominated by the inertia of global trajectories, and a mesoscopic level where will emerges as the capacity to orient possibilities without breaking the framework of the world. In this scheme, chance distributes probabilities, destiny acts as structural persistence, and free will consists of traversing a contour without a script, being compatible with a universe without teleological purpose.

1. Warning!

This text is written to be thought about. It is philosophy: ontology, logic, and epistemology. It attempts to explain the universe we observe and for which time, chance, will, and destiny would have to have meaning within it.

2. The dilemma of time

Time is often imagined as a place: a line, an axis, an extra dimension through which we advance. Mathematically this representation is correct and useful for modeling, but ontologically it is misleading.[1]

Time is **a virtual dimension**: a parameter that measures transformation, not a container that houses realities. If it were a real dimension like spatial ones, all realities —past, present, future— would exist simultaneously. But that is not what we experience.[2]

Time is not a space where something occurs, but the rhythm at which reality transforms itself. This transformation is observable because there is no universal coordinate of time; rather, it is a relative characteristic of each entity. We do not traverse time: we are transformed by it.

The past does not exist. It is not stored anywhere nor does it await recovery. It was consumed to build the present. The future also does not exist as something already given. It does not wait, it is not written, it does not await us. It is solely the open consequence of what happens now.

Ontologically, only the present exists. Reality is neither accumulated nor archived: it is actualized, it overwrites itself upon what already existed, reusing its parts, being a conservative system in its transformation. Each instant replaces the previous one and erases it. The universe does not keep backups. To

[1] This position opposes *eternalism* or the *block universe* theory where past, present, and future coexist. See McTaggart [1908] for the classic critique, and Price [1996] for a contemporary defense of atemporal perspectives.

[2] The conception of time as a virtual dimension aligns with *presentist* and *relationist* approaches. Compare with Bergson [1889] on real duration, and Rovelli [2017] on time as emergent from relations.

exist is to continually overwrite reality.

However, this present is not homogeneous. The most persistent error is believing that all reality is made of the same type of things, governed by the same type of necessity. That is not so. The universe is stratified.

3. The three levels of reality

3.1. The microscopic level

At the deepest level, the **microscopic**, there is no will or decision. Neither is there chaos. There is indeterminacy: a basic ontological openness.[3] Before all definition, multiple possible paths exist. This level does not choose, but it allows something new to occur, collapsing into a single possibility among many —this will sound familiar to you—.

Without this openness, everything would be fixed from the beginning and history would be an illusion, and you would be reading this text because it was already destined for you to do so and not because you chose to read it.

Will is not born here. But without this level, will would be impossible.

3.2. The hyperscopic level

At the opposite extreme lies the **hyperscopic**: the domain of cosmological order. Together with the mesoscopic level, it constitutes what we call the macroscopic: the realm where global inertia and local dynamics coexist.[4] Herein reside the regularities that persist, the robust and continuous trajectories that lend stability to the whole.

This level is not sensitive to local choices. Not because intervention is forbidden, but because the scale itself renders it immune. Will does not reach here. Not for lack of free will, but due to its limited scope of action, a product of a connected cascade of events.

3.3. The mesoscopic level

Between both extremes opens the only territory where free will can have meaning: the **mesoscopic**. The human, biological, and historical realm.[5] The place where a minimal difference can be amplified following rules that derive into a cascade of actions, a decision, a life —which gives free will its meaning.

Will operates here. Not as a mysterious force nor as a special substance, but as the capacity of complex systems to organize indeterminacy and turn it into direction.[6] Will does not create new possibilities. It does not break the framework. It does something more subtle: it tips the scales. It decides where to advance within a domain it did not choose.

4. Chance, destiny, and will

Here a persistent confusion often appears: identifying chance with chaos. Chance is not absence of structure. If a die has six faces, one can only choose among six possibilities. Chance does not invent routes; it catalyzes the choices that allow one to advance in one direction or another, but always within an established path.

Neither does destiny decide. Destiny is not a plan, nor a finality, nor a hidden cause. Destiny is pure inertia. It is the persistence of a global trajectory in the face of local deviations. It does not push, does not judge, does

[3] The concept of *ontological indeterminacy* employed here is broader than quantum indeterminacy, although compatible with it. It should not be identified with particular interpretations of quantum mechanics.

[4] The notion of *cospic inertia* developed here finds echoes in processual conceptions of reality. See Whitehead [1929] for a metaphysics where persistence emerges from the reiteration of processes.

[5] This ontological stratification recalls the traditional distinction between physical, biological, and mental levels, but with a different criterion: not by compositional complexity, but by *type of determination*.

[6] This conception of will engages both with *libertarian* positions such as Kane [1996], who see in indeterminacy the basis of freedom, and with *compatibilist* positions such as Dennett [2003], which emphasize agency as a product of natural complexity.

not correct. It remains. It defines the contour of the space of possibilities and restricts accessible routes without fixing each step.

Seen thus, becoming is not a written script nor an unpredictable chaos. It is a statistical problem with a contour. The framework defines the possible, chance distributes probabilities, will biases choices, and hyperscopic inertia maintains the general course.

Free will does not consist of escaping the contour, but of traversing it without a script.[7]

5. Essential irreversibility

That is why there is no return. To advance toward the future it is necessary to pass through the present, and the present irreversibly consumes what was. To live, interact, and decide entails loss. The past ceases to exist because it has been used. Irreversibility is not a defect of the world: it is its essential condition.[8]

The result is not a tragic universe nor an arbitrary one, but a hybrid universe. In the microscopic, there is possibility. In the hyperscopic, inertia dominates. While in the mesoscopic, will emerges as a cascade of actions triggered by the collapse of indeterminacy and constrained by macroscopic inertia.

Will does not exist to twist the order of the cosmos, but to write local trajectories within a stable framework.

6. Principle of ontological compatibility

The cosmos possesses an architecture that allows the emergence of beings with will, but it is not designed for them.[9] There is no inscribed finality, nor ontological privilege. The possibility that agents with free will exist does not imply that the universe was constructed in function of their appearance.

This principle resolves the apparent paradox of our condition: we are subjectively significant and, at the same time, cosmically insignificant.[10] Our experience is central to us, but marginal to the structure of the cosmos. There is no contradiction in this.

We are situated within a cosmos with a determined architecture that, among other things, allows something like us to arise. Compatibility does not imply intention. The fact that the universe admits life, consciousness, and will does not make it its purpose.

Destiny is not a condemnation. It is what prevents everything from dissolving.

Free will does not challenge the universe: it emerges as an essential part for the existence of conscious life.

Referencias

Henri Bergson. *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*. Alcan, 1889.

Daniel C. Dennett. *Freedom Evolves*. Viking Press, 2003.

Harry G. Frankfurt. Freedom of the will and the concept of a person. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 68(1):5–20, 1971.

Hans Jonas. *The Phenomenon of Life*. Harper & Row, 1966.

Robert Kane. *The Significance of Free Will*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

J. M. E. McTaggart. The unreality of time. *Mind*, 17:457–474, 1908.

Huw Price. *Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

[7] This formulation avoids both *hard determinism* and *radical libertarianism*. Its spirit is akin to the position of Frankfurt [1971], where freedom consists in identifying with one's own second-order desires, not in their indeterminate origin.

[8] The defense of irreversibility as fundamental, not derived, is found in Smolin [2013]. The position presented here is compatible, although with a more ontological than cosmological focus.

[9] This position rejects the *strong anthropic principle* while accepting a weak version: certain characteristics of the universe make life possible, but do not make it necessary nor teleologically oriented toward it.

[10] This insight finds resonance in Jonas [1966], who explores how life emerges as *freedom within necessity* in a cosmos not designed for it.

Carlo Rovelli. *L'ordine del tempo*. Adelphi, 2017. Traducción española: *El orden del tiempo*, Anagrama, 2018.

Lee Smolin. *Time Reborn*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013.

Alfred North Whitehead. *Process and Reality*. Macmillan, 1929.

License:

Creative Commons Attribution
(CC BY 4.0)
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

DaDoDs
68456@metalurgica.frc.utn.edu.ar